

Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, January 4, 2011 scheduled for 7:00 PM at the Westfield City Hall.

Opening of Meeting: 7:00 PM

Roll Call: Note Presence of a Quorum

Commission Members Present: Robert Smith, Pete Emigh, Dan Degnan, Cindy Spoljaric, Steve Hoover, Bob Horkay, Bill Sanders, and Danielle Tolan

City Staff Present: Matthew Skelton, Director; Kevin Todd, Senior Planner; Andrew Murray, Planner; and Brian Zaiger, City Attorney

Election of 2011 Officers:

Motion to appoint Robert Smith as President of the Advisory Plan Commission for 2011.

Motion: Emigh; Second: Degnan; Vote: Passed by Voice Vote

Motion to appoint Cindy Spoljaric as Vice President of the Advisory Plan Commission for 2011.

Motion: Sanders; Second: Smith; Vote: Passed by Voice Vote

Approval of the Minutes:

Motion to approve minutes of December 20, 2010 as presented.

Motion: Emigh; Second: Horkay; Vote: Passed by Voice Vote

Todd reviewed the Advisory Plan Commission Rules of Procedure.

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Case No. 1012-CPA-01

Petitioner City of Westfield

Description Comprehensive Plan Amendment; petitioner is requesting an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate the Family Sports Capital Addendum II.

Skelton reviewed the history of the proposed amendment, which would identify the selected location which of the Family Sports Capital of America on the Comprehensive Plan map.

Motion to send 1012-CPA-01 to the Westfield City Council with a favorable recommendation.

Motion: Emigh; Second: Horkay; Vote: 7-1 (Sanders)

Case No. 1101-PUD-01

1 Petitioner Estridge Development Company
2 Description Northeast corner of Ditch Road & 146th Street; Petitioner requests an amendment to the
3 development standards that relate to the overall project in the Centennial South PUD.
4

5 Murray introduced the proposal, which is to modify one sentence in the current Centennial South PUD
6 ordinance. The amendment would allow builders other than Estridge Companies to build homes within
7 this PUD. He introduced Mr. Brian Stumpf from the Estridge Companies to give a brief presentation.
8

9 Stumpf stated that the request affects the remaining vacant lots, which will be purchased by a private
10 investor. He further stated that the architectural standards for these remaining lots will remain the same.
11

12 A Public Hearing opened at 7:10 p.m.
13

14 Mr. Bruce Watson asked what will guarantee that the houses built by other builders will be built
15 to the same quality and specifications as the existing homes. He also asked when the amenities
16 will be completed. He referenced missing street trees and a broken sign. He asked who will be
17 responsible for correcting the things which are wrong and completing the items which have not
18 been completed.
19

20 The Public Hearing closed at 7:12 p.m.
21

22 Stumpf responded to public comments by stating that Estridge will complete the remaining
23 unfinished items in Centennial South. He further stated that the standards and requirements for
24 the remaining homes would be the same as they are now, noting that those standards in the PUD
25 Ordinance are not changing.
26

27 Hoover asked when the tree scapes will be completed and when the damaged sign will be
28 repaired.
29

30 Stumpf stated that he will check into the damaged sign. He also stated that the street trees are
31 typically installed as sections are completed.
32

33 Smith reopened the Public Hearing at 7:15 p.m.
34

35 Mr. Allen Vanrykenham asked for the name of the gentlemen representing Estridge and declined
36 further comment.
37

38 Skelton responded that Mr. Bryan Stumpf was representing Estridge.
39

40 The Public Hearing closed at 7:16 p.m.
41
42
43
44
45

46 Case No. 1101-PUD-02

1 Petitioner Wilfong Land Companies LLC
2 Description Northeast corner of State Road 32 & Casey Road; Petitioner requests a change in zoning
3 of approximately 897 acres from the Eagletown PUD to the Springmill Trails PUD.
4

5 Todd introduced the petition, which is to rezone most of the existing Eagletown PUD (with the exception
6 of the property east of Springmill Road and south of SR 32) to the Springmill Trails PUD. He further
7 explained that the proposal would modify the standards of the new PUD area. He added that the main
8 purpose of tonight's meeting is to hear from the petitioner and hold a public hearing.
9

10 Mr. Beau Wilfong presented the details of Springmill Trails, which has previously been known as
11 Eagletown. He explained that the City of Westfield has embarked on a new image of the City, which
12 includes three major components: the trail system, Grand Junction, and the sports campus. He further
13 explained that by taking those three elements into consideration, the PUD was renamed so the new
14 essence of the City of Westfield could be captured. He stated that trails will be a major part of the
15 development. Wilfong then reviewed the development's five districts.
16

17 Sanders asked about the density, stating that it was mentioned that there would be no increase in density.
18 He questioned how this could be possible, because the proposal is to make an area that was approved for
19 two units per acre to be allowed up to three units per acre.
20

21 Mr. Jon Dobosiewicz responded stating that the number of homes north of 186th Street will not change.
22 He further added that the proposal is to include the property east of Springmill Road, which has been
23 identified by the City as part of the sports facility, as part of the open space calculation for the PUD. He
24 added that previously there were approximately 280 homes planned for these 94 acres, and that overall
25 the number of homes that were previously going to be built has been reduced.
26

27 A Public Hearing opened at 7:36 p.m.
28

29 Ms. Melda Corn expressed concern about noise, traffic, and the possibility of an auto accident
30 damaging her fence, allowing for her horses to escape. She also asked about what part of her
31 property will be taken when Springmill Road is widened.
32

33 Mr. Joe Plankis reviewed the history of the original Eagletown project and expressed concern
34 about some of the proposed changes, including: accessory buildings in Section One, reduction of
35 setbacks, home square footages, minimum lot size reduction, windows, and vinyl siding now
36 being permitted. He believes that the product has been substantially cheapened and is nowhere
37 near what was approved five years ago. He also suggested that the Commission assign a
38 subcommittee to work through this petition.
39

40 Mr. Mark Wisely owns property abutting the proposed development on the commercial side and
41 expressed support for the overall development, stating that he has discussed his concerns with
42 Wilfong.
43

44 Mr. Craig Wood asked for more details on the Residential 2 District, since it is adjacent to his
45 family's property.
46

1 Mr. John Dippel expressed concern regarding Article 12.7 Open Space, stating that the petitioner
2 has requested that 94 acres which are not included in the PUD be considered as Green Space in
3 the PUD. He further stated that there are fifty word changes that deal with either landscaping,
4 square footage, mounding or trees. He added that there are 180 redline changes to the PUD,
5 which makes this appear as a brand new PUD and should be submitted as such. He also asked
6 for a clear definition of Accessory Buildings.

7
8 The Public Hearing closed at 7:52 p.m.
9

10 Dobosiewicz stated that the petitioner has submitted information as requested and anticipates the
11 Commission will direct them on the appropriate course of action before forwarding this on to the
12 City Council with a recommendation. He stated the willingness of the petitioner to meet with
13 anyone necessary.
14

15 Degnan asked about the open space and the specific reason to take those out.
16

17 Dobosiewicz responded that in the original PUD, which included the 94 acres, the petitioner
18 committed to a 25-acre park facility; on the new proposal, the petitioner is committing to 94
19 acres of contiguous open space where previously there was not 94 acres of open space.
20

21 Spoljaric does not think there is enough open space in the project, considering this is an
22 environmentally-sensitive area. She also expressed concern about the standards being lowered in
23 a project that already had standards that were not very high. She also asked the petitioner to
24 consider that the City is trying to reduce the number of curb cuts on SR 32.
25

26 Smith asked the Commission if there were any thoughts on forming a subcommittee. He
27 suggested that the Commission members get all of their comments to staff in the next two weeks.
28 He further mentioned that at that point, additional consideration will be given regarding the
29 creation of a subcommittee for this item.
30

31 Case No. 1101-REZ-01
32 Petitioner Rick and Jennifer Lane
33 Description 1901 SR 32 West; Petitioners request a change in zoning from the SF-5 District to the
34 GB District of approximately 0.67 acres.
35

36 Todd introduced the petition, which is to change the zoning of two existing lots in the Eagletown area.
37 He stated that the petitioner would like to use the property for auto sales and auto repair.
38

39 Smith asked how this fits into the Comprehensive Plan.
40

41 Todd stated there is an extensive discussion in the staff report about how this relates to the
42 Comprehensive Plan. He further explained that the use fits within the Comprehensive Plan, but added
43 that there are some components which may not fall within the Comprehensive Plan.
44

45 Spoljaric asked if this would this be allowed in local business.
46

47 Todd responded that Auto Sales, Service & Repair is only allowed in the General Business District.

1
2 Horkay asked if there had been any consideration given to restricting the uses on this property?

3
4 Mr. Rick Lane responded that he does not have any objections to removing uses from the use list.

5
6 Spoljaric asked how many service bays this facility will have.

7
8 Lane responded that there could be five or six, but said that it ultimately depends on what INDOT does
9 with SR 32. He added that given the proximity to the highway now, they may lose all or part of the
10 existing building in the future. He added that if they lost part of it, then we would likely have
11 approximately three bays, which would support lifts and a couple of smaller bays for smaller, minor
12 repairs.

13
14 Sanders asked for confirmation that Lane would be installing containment provisions and recovery
15 systems within the building.

16
17 Lane responded that he would not be installing those systems. He added that he will, however, contain
18 any liquids pulled out of the vehicles, noting that this type of business will deal more with solvents,
19 degreasers, etc. and not a the typical "quick-lube" fluids. He added that they would use a cleaning tank
20 with a regular filtering and cleaning process, stating that the tank would be regularly exchanged with a
21 new tank.

22
23 A Public Hearing opened at 8:26 p.m.

24
25 Ms. Marjorie Cross expressed concern about what the end project will look like. She also
26 expressed concern about sewage and asked if people on SR 32 will be connected in to the sewer
27 system.

28
29 The Public Hearing closed at 8:28 p.m.

30
31 Hoover expressed concern about what the project will end up looking like and how in the future
32 a General Business designation for this property may affect Eagletown and the City's vision for
33 that sometime in the future.

34
35 Skelton stated that staff will come up with a list of uses for the Commission's review and
36 approval.

37
38 Hoover asked if restrictions can be put into the approval regarding screening.

39
40 Lane responded they will work with the Commission to ensure the property does not become an
41 eyesore.

42
43
44
45
46
47 Case No. 1101-ZOA-01

1 Petitioner City of Westfield
2 Description 800 East Main Street; Petitioner is requesting amendments to sections WC 16.08.010
3 (Sign Standards), WC 16.07.010 (Lighting Standards) and WC 16.04.210 (Definitions) of
4 the Westfield-Washington Township Zoning Ordinance.
5

6 Todd reviewed the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance regarding the sign ordinance, and
7 lighting standards and definitions as they apply to the sign ordinance. He explained that there are four
8 main changes, including: 1) clarifying the applicability section; when does the Sign Ordinance apply and
9 to whom; 2) adding new electronic signage standards, specifically for time and temperature signs and gas
10 price signs and the use of LED technology; 3) creating a new temporary sign, "Temporary Ornamental
11 Banners,"; and 4) creating a new temporary sign, "Builder/Developer Sequential Signs."
12

13 A Public Hearing opened at 8:46 p.m.
14

15 No one spoke and the Public Hearing closed at 8:47 p.m.
16

17
18 **ADJOURNMENT** (8:51 p.m.)
19

20 Approved (date)
21

22 _____
23 President, Robert Smith, Esq.
24

25 _____
26 Vice President, Cindy Spoljaric
27

28 _____
29 Secretary, Matthew S. Skelton, Esq.